IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 33 OF 2006

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 791 OF 2004

Maria Ignatius Parmar ... Petitioner

Vs.

Slum Rehabilitation Authorityh

& Anr. ... Respondents

Mr. P.M.Havnur for the petitioner.

Mr. Mr. M.S.Menkon with B.R.Maurya for the Respondent No.2.

CORAM: S.K.SHAH,J.

DATE : 6th October, 2006.

P.C.

1. The Contempt Petition was filed on 12.1.2006. The contempt alleged is of the order dated 2nd April, 2004. The grievance of the petitioner is that the SRA was directed to grant personal hearing to the petitioner and after considering the documentary evidence produced by her, pass appropriate order within 8 weeks from the receipt of the application from the petitioner. He was further directed that till the petitioner's claim is decided and for a period of four weeks thereafter, one

tenement in the new building shall be kept reserved for the petitioner.

2. It seems that the application filed by the petitioner was not decided by the S.R.A. and before that the present Contempt Petition came to be filed. It is an admitted position that subsequent thereto, the petitioner's claim was decided by the S.R.A. on 18.4.2006 holding that she is eligible. Therefore, the later part of the order to keep one tenement reserved was operative from 18.4.2006. The original petition that was filed was premature. No grievance was made that the Respondent had not kept any tenement vacant. It is by way of amendment that the grievance was made that the Contempt Petition itself was premature and the amendment sought on 23rd August 2006.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner states that by the time the amendment was made, no tenement was kept vacant.

4. In these circumstances, I do not find any merit in the Contempt Petition. The Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

(S.K.SHAH,J.)